

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

CHARLES W. BILLUPS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	8:03CV0297
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
MURAT OKAY GEMICI, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on filing no. 101, the motion for appointment of counsel filed by the plaintiff. The court cannot routinely appoint counsel in civil cases. In Davis v. Scott, 94 F.3d 444, 447 (8th Cir. 1996), the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals explained: “‘Indigent civil litigants do not have a constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel.’... The trial court has broad discretion to decide whether both the plaintiff and the court will benefit from the appointment of counsel, taking into account the factual and legal complexity of the case, the presence or absence of conflicting testimony, and the plaintiff's ability to investigate the facts and present his claim.” (Citations omitted.) The plaintiff has capably presented the factual basis for the claims in this proceeding. I find that appointment of counsel is not necessary to enable the plaintiff to pursue those claims. Therefore, filing no. 101 is denied in its entirety.

SO ORDERED.

DATED this 10th day of June, 2005.

BY THE COURT:

s/F.A. GOSSETT
United States Magistrate Judge